

# The First Century of the Monastery of Hosios Loukas

NICOLAS OIKONOMIDES

The present study has developed from a seminar held at the University of Athens in 1989–90,<sup>1</sup> and attempts to answer questions asked by visitors to the monastery of Hosios Loukas in Phokis. How is it that such large buildings, luxurious mosaics, frescoes, and marble revetments are found on a mountain slope in a region that has never been especially wealthy, close to the small village of Steiri? Is this grandiose monument the result of local initiative or was it financed from Constantinople? Did the building of this monastery respond to specific needs, and has it been favored by any objective historical conditions? The neighboring ruins of Delphi show that the region had, since antiquity, a tendency to become a religious center, but this pagan tradition does not in itself explain very much.

## I. A FUNERARY INSCRIPTION

The discussion opens with an inscription preserved in the lapidarium of the monastery. It is a marble plaque, 0.73 × 0.45 m, broken into at least five pieces now glued together. Initially it was found upside down in the outer western wall of the church of the Panagia; the monks removed it from there during repair work conducted in 1873–78. An ignorant monk, thinking that it was a pagan remain, hammered and broke it, and since then some pieces have been lost. Yet its text can be restored almost in its entirety.

This is a funerary inscription, and, consequently, its position in the outer wall of the church was not the original one. Since it was placed there upside down, it had obviously been salvaged during previous repairs. Its dimensions show that it could not have served as the cover of a sarcophagus. Instead, I imagine it above an arcosolium,

<sup>1</sup>The seminar, conducted by P. Vokotopoulos, A. Kominis, N. Oikonomides, and S. Troianos, was entitled “The Monastery of Hosios Loukas and Its Region.”

marking a grave situated in an enclosed space, in a church or, more probably, in a crypt.

The inscription was first published by G. Kremos,<sup>2</sup> then by G. Sotiriou<sup>3</sup> and by E. Stikas (with a good photograph).<sup>4</sup> Kremos and Stikas dated the inscription to the tenth century and proposed that the monk Theodosios mentioned in it be identified with a disciple of St. Luke (d. 953). Sotiriou dated it to the twelfth century. All three expressed reservations about these datings and declared that a reliable answer could be expected only from a specialist in Byzantine epigraphy.

The inscription is engraved with elongated capital letters of varying height, with many abbreviations and even more ligatures. It includes breathings and accents. The seven lines at the beginning cover the entire width of the marble slab, whereas the last line covers only one-third of it. The text is metrical: twelve dodecasyllabic verses, separated on the stone by crosslets of dots (except for one pellet that appears between verses 11 and 12). At the end of the inscription there is a cross; another cross probably appeared at its beginning, but is now lost. Several spelling mistakes and omissions of accents and breathings occur in the text.

In what follows, the text of the inscription is reproduced as faithfully as possible. Abbreviations are analyzed in parentheses, reconstructions are placed within square brackets, and uncertain letters are marked with a sublinear dot. The text is printed in verses according to the meter. The change of line on the stone is marked by a double vertical line. An apparatus follows the text to display instances where the proposed reading or re-

<sup>2</sup>G. Kremos, Φωκιά, Προσκυνητάριον τῆς ἐν τῇ Φωκίδι μονῆς τοῦ Ὁσίου Λουκᾶ, I–III (Athens, 1874–80), II, 173–74.

<sup>3</sup>G. A. Sotiriou, Νεώτεραι ἐπιγραφαὶ περὶ τῆς τεχνικῆς τῶν μωσαῖκῶν ἐπὶ τῇ εὐκαιρίᾳ ἐπισκευῶν τοῦ καθολικοῦ τῆς βυζαντινῆς μονῆς τοῦ Ὁσίου Λουκᾶ. Ἐπιγραφαὶ καὶ χαράγματα, Ἀρχ. Δελτ. 6 (1920–21; pub. 1923), 181–82.

<sup>4</sup>E. Stikas, Τὸ οἰκοδομικὸν χρονικὸν τῆς μονῆς Ὁσίου Λουκᾶ (Athens, 1970), 27–29.

construction differs from those of previous editors.

[ + Τὰς καλήσεις πάσας φερωνούμως πλουτήσας :· τάς τε γενητάς (καὶ) || [τὰς ἐκ] βασιλέων [···]  
 3 ἐν τῷ ἔραν με τεύξασθαι σ(ωτῆ)οίας :·  
 αἱ καλήσεις || [πά]λι[ν;] μετημείφθησαν οὐτως[···]  
 6 Θεόδωρος πρὸν Θεοδόσιος αὐθῆς :·  
 ἀνθύπατος δ ἄψαυστος (;) αὐτὸς μονάζων :·  
 δ π(ατ)ρόκιος π(ατ)ρικῶς ὑπηγμένος :·  
 δ κατεπάνω κάτω τῶν ὑψαυχοῦντων :·  
 9 δ δε γε βέστης μύστης || τοιχηνοφόρος :·  
 οὐδὲν ἐπ[αγ]ώμενος τῶν ὑπαρξάντων :·  
 τῆς λάρῳ[ν]ακος πλὴν ἡς κέρδος οὐδὲν ἄλλω.  
 12 τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ συγκά[λ]υμμα θανοῦσι. +

God endowed me with many appellations, those coming from ancestry as well as those coming from the emperors. But as I strove to attain salvation, the names changed as follows: Theodore became Theodosios; the untouchable(?) anthypatos himself became a monk; the patrikios shrank to a [spiritual] father; the katepano submitted to the haughty; the vestes became a mystic in hairy garb. He did not take with him any part of his fortune, except for this coffin that covers the dead: this is his only worldly gain.

1 [Εἰς καλήσεις Sotiriou, κτήσεις Kremos, || 2 ἐκ Kremos, Sotiriou: τῶν Stikas || 3 μετεύξασθαι Stikas || 4 πάλιν scripsi· (πάσας;) Sotiriou | μετημείφθησαν Kremos, Sotiriou, Stikas, μετημείφθησαν corr. Sotiriou || 6 δ' ἄψαυστος αὐτὸς scripsi: δ' αντακτος Kremos, λαμ(πρὸς νῦν αὐ)τὸς Sotiriou, λαμ(πρὸς)..(αὐ)τὸς Stikas || 8 τῶν:ν(όν) Sotiriou

### Commentary

Lines 1–2. Κλήσεις, literally “appellations,” can be titles or names. See, for example, the expression τιμᾶς καὶ κλήσεις in the letter addressed by Nicholas Mystikos to Tsar Symeon of Bulgaria.<sup>5</sup> From this phrase we may conclude that Theodore had a distinguished family name (γενικὴ [from γένος] κλήσις) as well as titles that he had received from (successive?) emperors (κλήσεις ἐκ βασιλέων).

Line 1. Φερωνύμως, “as his name shows”: he received these κλήσεις as if they were gifts of God; this is a play on the name Theodore in its initial meaning “gift of God.”

Line 3. The word με shows that the inscription was drafted by Theodore/Theodosios himself, or at least when he was still alive.

Line 4. The word πάλιν is not certain. At this point only the lower part of the letters can be read, that is (from left to right), one vertical stroke, an oblique stroke that presumably struck the vertical

one at a higher point and that joins another vertical stroke at the bottom; this is followed by the ligature ME of μετημείφθησαν. This combination of two vertical strokes and an oblique one cannot be read as the letter N, because in this inscription the oblique stroke of N meets the vertical that follows at a certain height, never at the bottom; it looks rather like a ligature of AI (cf. the beginning of line 4) or of ΛΗ (cf. the word πλὴν of line 11). My hypothesis is that we have here the ligature ΛΙ with N added at the top of the final vertical stroke (cf. the letter T of κατεπάνω, on line 8).

Line 5. From this line it is clear that Theodore was the person’s name as a layman, and that Theodosios was his name as a monk.

Line 6. The reconstruction of this line is problematic. I examined the inscription and can say with certainty that after the word ἀνθύπατος there is a Δ, followed by traces of three letters. Above the first of these three uncertain letters, there are, clearly engraved although not clearly visible on photographs, a smooth breathing and an acute accent: consequently, the first uncertain letter has to be a vowel and, because of the shape of its remnants, it cannot be anything but Α. The second uncertain letter consists of one vertical stroke with no horizontal addition at its top. This could be an Ι, a Φ or a Ψ, if we suppose that the horizontal protrusions of these letters were placed under the break and are now lost. The remnant of the third uncertain letter, an oblique line, could be the top of a Χ or an Υ, as well as of an Α, a Δ, or a Λ. We can say with certainty, *causa metri*, that the lacuna must have contained a three-syllable word with the accent on the first syllable, which would contain an α or an αι. For this reason, I propose, without much conviction, the adjective ἄψαυστος (i.e., one who cannot be touched by commoners), which makes better sense than ἄφατος or ἄφαντος.

Line 7. Πατρίκιος - πατρικῶς is another play on words. The expression πατρικῶς ὑπηγμένος means one who is “led to” or “reduced to” being a father. The word “father” would seem to indicate that Theodosios was the abbot of the monastery, “supervising in a fatherly way” his fellow monks. Admittedly, the expression is not crystal clear, but the abbot hypothesis is supported by the following.

Line 8. Another play on the words κατεπάνω - κάτω, the word κατεπάνω literally meaning “one who is above.” Here again the phrase is not clear. Who are these haughty individuals (ὑψαυχοῦντες) to whom Theodosios was subordinate? This expression cannot refer to other monks, especially

<sup>5</sup>Nicholas I, Patriarch of Constantinople, Letters, ed. R. J. H. Jenkins and L. G. Westerink (Washington, D.C., 1973), p. 48.

since the inscription was placed in the monastery. Thus it is necessary to consider other authorities to whom Theodosios had to submit: government or, rather, church officials, such as the metropolitan of Thebes. If so, we have here another indication that Theodosios exercised some power inside the monastery and, because of his status, had to submit to the authorities outside it: obviously this points to his being the higoumenos.

Line 9. Note the alliteration βέστης - μύστης.

Lines 10–12. The inscription was made for a λάρναξ, that is, a “coffin,” a “sarcophagus,” or another funerary monument that Theodosios built for himself, using his own money, not the monastery’s. This monument was the only belonging that he could take with him in death. As it is very unlikely that this monument was built right after Theodosios’ entry into the monastery, it may be assumed that he had kept some contact with his family and its wealth.

The inscription has a flavor of elite society hardly befitting the monastic ideal of modesty. Theodosios took pride in his name, in his titles, in abandoning all this to become the spiritual father of his fellow monks, and in agreeing to submit to non-monastic authorities. And he chose to make all this abundantly clear in the inscription. Although much opposed to the monastic tradition, his attitude seems not to have provoked a scandal. Was it because Theodosios was entitled to special honors, perhaps because he was a donor?

While the collection of dated inscriptions announced by I. Ševčenko and C. Mango awaits publication, I would hesitate to advance a date for this inscription based on epigraphic criteria. But a fairly secure date can be established thanks to internal elements, especially the titles that Theodore received before joining the monastery.

Terminus post quem: from the middle of the tenth century, the office of katepano (or doux) indicated a highly ranked officer (superior to the strategoi), a military commander of the heavy cavalry of the tagmata stationed in provinces close to the frontier. The first high-ranking katepano appears in Italy in 970; the position seems to have been created by Nikephoros Phokas (963–969).<sup>6</sup> Concurrently, during the reign of Nikephoros Phokas, the title of vestes also appears, indicating court personnel attached theoretically to the ser-

vice of the imperial vestiarium. The title remained in use throughout the eleventh century and is last mentioned around the year 1100.<sup>7</sup> As a result, it is clear that our inscription cannot date before the reign of Nikephoros Phokas (and consequently, the Theodosios of the inscription cannot be a disciple of St. Luke). A secure terminus post quem would be the year 970.

Terminus ante quem: the titles that had been bestowed upon Theodore disappear from the sources in the late eleventh/early twelfth century. The vestes, the anthypatos, and the patrikios are last mentioned in 1087, 1088, and well before 1112 respectively; in southern Italy, which no longer belonged to the empire, they are last mentioned in the period 1099–1111.<sup>8</sup> These titles, which also guaranteed a place in the senate, depreciated in importance because they were freely distributed by various eleventh-century emperors, in particular Constantine IX (who opened the senate to bureaucrats), Constantine X (who opened it to tradesmen and craftsmen), and Nikephoros Botaneiates (who distributed so many titles that the state treasury could not meet the yearly salaries of the title holders). The value of the titles correspondingly declined. Once in power, Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118) endeavored to create a new hierarchy of titles based on the title sebastos and its derivatives.<sup>9</sup> The former titles, now useless, disappeared. A secure terminus ante quem for our inscription would therefore be the reign of Nikephoros Botaneiates (1078–81), if not that of Constantine X Doukas (1059–67).

This general dating between 970 and 1078 (or 1059) can be narrowed down if the titles normally bestowed upon doukes or katepano at different moments within that period are taken into consideration. It is true that there was never a strict correspondence between administrative positions and honorific titles, as the latter were personal in character and could have been bestowed by the emperor for reasons completely unrelated to the administration—for example, to underscore a personal relationship. But the known lists of

<sup>7</sup> *Les listes*, 294.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 294, 295 and *Actes de Docheiariou*, ed. N. Oikonomides (Paris, 1984), no. 3, line 15.

<sup>9</sup> I have described this procedure in “L’évolution de l’organisation administrative de l’empire byzantin au XIe siècle (1025–1118),” *TM* 6 (1976), 125–28. The subject has been examined in much more depth by P. Lemerle, *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantin* (Paris, 1977), 287–93, 309–12 and by J.-C. Cheynet, “Dévaluation des dignités et dévaluation monétaire dans la seconde moitié du XIe siècle,” *Byzantion* 53 (1983), 453–77.

<sup>6</sup> N. Oikonomides, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles* (Paris, 1972), 342, 344; J.-C. Cheynet, “Du stratège de thème au duc: Chronologie de l’évolution au cours du XIe siècle,” *TM* 9 (1985), 181–94.

doukes or katepano show the following characteristics:<sup>10</sup>

(1) From 1050 on, all known doukes or katepano bear the title of magistros or a superior title; consequently our inscription, which mentions the inferior titles of anthypatos, vestes, and patrikios, reflects a situation earlier than 1050.

(2) The titles anthypatos, patrikios, and vestes had been bestowed upon some katepano in the late tenth century; but later, especially during the reign of Basil II (976–1025), who left behind vivid memories of his stinginess in bestowing honorific titles, the katepano descended to the lower level of the protospatharioi; such a katepano was Christophoros Bourgaris, the founder of the Panagia ton Chalkeon in 1028.<sup>11</sup> Katepano accompanied by the titles anthypatos, patrikios, and vestes reappear between 1020 and 1050. This is the period during which Theodore/Theodosios must have had these titles while still a katepano, shortly before deciding to leave the world and retire to the monastery of Hosios Loukas, where he was to become an abbot.

## II. THE ABBOT OF HOSIOS LOUKAS, THEODOSIOS LEOBACHOS

An abbot of Hosios Loukas named Theodosios Leobachos lived at approximately the same time. This information comes from the typikon of a religious confraternity created in Thebes in order to promote the cult of the Virgin Naupaktitissa, an icon belonging to the nunnery of the same name. The document is preserved in the Cappella Palatina in Palermo, where it seems to have been brought by the Normans after the sack of Thebes in 1147. It has been published several times.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup>I have used the following lists of doukes and katepano. Antioch: V. Laurent, "La chronologie des gouverneurs d'Antioche sous la seconde domination byzantine," *MUSJ* 38.10 (1962), 221–54; Bulgaria and Paradounavon: N. Banescu, *Les duchés byzantins de Paristrion (Paradounavon) et de Bulgarie* (Bucharest, 1946), 134–69; Thessaloniki: P. Lemerie, *Philippe et la Macédoine orientale à l'époque chrétienne et byzantine* (Paris, 1945), 156 ff; Italy: Vera von Falkenhausen, *La dominazione bizantina nell'Italia meridionale dal IX al XI secolo* (Bari, 1978), 85–100; Edessa, Iberia, Baspurakhan: K. Yuzbashian, "L'administration byzantine en Arménie aux Xe–XIe siècles," *REArm* 10 (1973–74), 139–83 and V. A. Arutjunova-Fidanjan, *Armjane-Halkidonity na vostočnih granicah vizantijskog imperija (XI v.)* (Erevan, 1980), passim. I also took into account the additions by Cheynet, "Du stratège de thème" (above, note 6).

<sup>11</sup>J. M. Spieser, "Inventaires en vue d'un recueil des inscriptions historiques de Byzance, I. Les inscriptions de Thessalonique," *TM* 5 (1973), 163–64.

<sup>12</sup>The latest edition, considerably better than all previous ones, is by J. Nesbitt and J. Wiita, "A Confraternity of the Comnenian Era," *BZ* 68 (1975), 360–84. Nothing new is to be found

This religious confraternity was founded in 1048. Some fifty years later, the initial document had suffered from time; the confraternity therefore had it written anew, decorated with an image of the Virgin (presumably a copy of the icon of the Naupaktitissa), and confirmed with new original signatures and signa. This is the document preserved in Palermo.

In a special paragraph of this typikon, we find a list of those to be mentioned in the liturgy:

We will mention our orthodox emperors, our sainted patriarch, the sacred metropolitan of Thebes, the most holy monk and abbot of Steirion, that is, the late kyr Theodosios Leobachos, the abbot of this monastery at that time, the abbess of the nunnery of the Naupaktitissai, and all our confraternity, those alive and those who have died, and all the Christian people.<sup>13</sup>

The enumeration follows hierarchical order: the emperors (of the moment), the patriarch (of the moment), the metropolitan of Thebes (of the moment), the holiest abbot of Hosios Loukas, Theodosios Leobachos, who was dead, the abbot of Hosios Loukas (of the moment), the abbesses of the Naupaktitissai (presumably of the moment), current and former members of the confraternity. Those who are mentioned were in positions of authority at the time of the liturgy (including the abbot of Hosios Loukas); the only deceased persons mentioned are Theodosios Leobachos and former members of the confraternity. Hence it would seem that Theodosios played an important role in creating the confraternity and for this reason was entitled to special mention in future liturgies.<sup>14</sup>

Moreover, the confraternity and the nunnery of the Virgin Naupaktitissa were undoubtedly depen-

in Th. Paliouras, "Η ἀδελφότητα τῆς Θεοτόκου τῆς Ναυπακτιώτισσῆς" καὶ ἡ σχέση τῆς μὲ τὴν περιοχὴν τῶν Θηβῶν κατὰ τὴν μεσοβυζαντινὴν περίοδο. Ἀπόψεις καὶ προβλήματα, "Ἐπετηρίς τῆς Ἐταιρείας Βοιωτικῶν Μελετῶν" 1.1 (Athens, 1988), 613–23. Even less interesting is the publication of E. Koutsogiannes, Παναγία ἡ Ναυπακτιώτισσα, Ναυπακτιακά 4 (1988–89), 7–24, who ignores the edition of Nesbitt and Wiita.

<sup>13</sup>Nesbitt and Wiita, "Confraternity," 364–65 (text revised): μνεῖσαν ποιουμένων ἡμῶν τῶν ὁρθοδόξων ἡμῶν βασιλέων, τοῦ ἀγωτάτου πατριάρχου, τοῦ ἱερωτάτου μητροπολίτου Θηβῶν, τοῦ πανοσίου ἐκείνου μοναχού καὶ ἥγουμένου τῶν Στειρίου καὶ Θεοδοσίου τοῦ Λεωβάχου, τοῦ περιόντος τῆς αὐτῆς μονῆς, τῶν ἥγουμενουσῶν ἐν τῇ τῶν Ναυπακτιτησῶν μονῇ, τῆς δόης ἡμῶν ἀδελφότητος, τῶν τε περιόντων καὶ τῶν προαπελθόντων, καὶ παντὸς τοῦ χριστιανικοῦ πληρώματος. The reading Θεοδοσίου is based on the idea that a superscript o is the standard abbreviation for οσ and that the vertical line indicates an abbreviation by omission.

<sup>14</sup>This is a very plausible hypothesis put forth by Nesbitt and Wiita, "Confraternity," 374.

dencies of Hosios Loukas. This is why the abbot of this monastery (who does not sign the typikon) had the right to be mentioned before the abbess of the Naupaktitissa: obviously he represented a superior ecclesiastical authority, between the metropolitan of Thebes and the abbess.

Theodosios belonged to the important Theban family of the Leobachoi, landowners known from the tenth century. Several members of this family had been imperial officials (*ἄρχοντες, κουράτορες*), others were honored with titles such as *σπαθάριος, σπαθαροκανδίδατος, πρωτοσπαθάριος*. They were related by marriage to other influential families of the region.<sup>15</sup>

Theodosios Leobachos was the abbot of Hosios Loukas in 1048, when the typikon of the confraternity was written: most probably he was instrumental in drafting this document. We do not know when he became the abbot or when he died. I believe that this Theodosios Leobachos is the same person as Theodore/Theodosios of the inscription. Both came from an important and wealthy family of the region, both had contacts with the court of Constantinople, both had been higoumenoi, both lived at approximately the same time.

In view of the next argument, I consider it important to stress that in the typikon Theodosios Leobachos is called *πανόσιος*.

### III. THE “HOSIOS” THEODOSIOS, ABBOT OF HOSIOS LOUKAS

The study of the early history of the monastery of Hosios Loukas was renewed in 1969 with M. Chatzidakis' work on the founder of the main church of the monastery.<sup>16</sup> A long discussion ensued and diverging opinions appeared, without weakening the main points of Chatzidakis' theory.<sup>17</sup> Scholarly literature has since been enriched with many new and important publica-

<sup>15</sup> See N. Svoronos, “Recherches sur le cadastre byzantin et la fiscalité aux XIe et XIIe siècles,” *BCH* 83 (1959), 73–75 and Nesbitt and Wiita, “Confraternity,” 374.

<sup>16</sup> M. Chatzidakis, “A propos de la date et du fondateur de Saint-Luc,” *CahArch* 19 (1969), 127–50.

<sup>17</sup> Shortly after the publication of this article, E. Stikas criticized Chatzidakis' point of view in an appendix to his Τὸ οἰκοδομικὸν χρονικόν; Chatzidakis replied, adding new arguments in favor of his theory: Περὶ μονῆς Ὁσίου Λουκᾶ νεώτερα, *Ἐλληνικά* 25 (1972), 298–313; see also “Précisions sur le fondateur de Saint Luc,” *CahArch* 22 (1972), 87–88. Stikas returned to the question two years later: Οἱ κτίτωρες τῶν καθολικῶν τῆς μονῆς τοῦ Ὁσίου Λουκᾶ (Athens, 1974); more recently D. Pallass wrote “Zur Topographie und Chronologie von Hosios Lukas: Eine kritische Übersicht,” *BZ* 78 (1985), 94–107.

tions,<sup>18</sup> and others of equal importance are forthcoming.<sup>19</sup>

Chatzidakis' point of view can be summarized as follows. In the canticle written for the translation of the relics of St. Luke (a Byzantine text, published by Kremos), it is repeatedly stated that the saint's remains have been placed inside a new church built by an abbot named Philotheos for this occasion (*ἥγειτε*). This Philotheos is depicted three times in the frescoes of Hosios Loukas. (a) In the crypt, at the groin vault above the southeast tomb, there are four portraits of higoumenoi, whose names are known from the accompanying inscriptions. One of them is called Philotheos. We shall return to this painting. (b) Again in the crypt, close to the entrance, we find a composition with many monks; although there is no inscription here, in the first row it is easy to recognize the portraits of three of the higoumenoi also represented in the groin vault; the third of them is Philotheos. (c) At the northeastern chapel of the katholikon, next to the actual tomb of St. Luke, there is a poorly preserved fresco representing the offering of a model of a church by the same Philotheos to St. Luke. Thus the paintings offer unexpected confirmation of the textual testimony.

St. Luke was first buried in his cell, which was at the level of what is now the crypt. A first church was built around his tomb, later rebuilt by Philotheos to become the actual katholikon. The saint's relics were placed inside the monumental tomb, which still exists at the same floor level as the katholikon.

When did this happen? It must have been during the eleventh century, as almost all scholars concur that the monastery's pictorial decoration dates from then.<sup>20</sup> On the other hand, it is clearly stated

<sup>18</sup> L. Bouras, ‘Ο γλυπτὸς διάκοσμος τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Παναγίας στὸ μοναστήριο τοῦ Ὁσίου Λουκᾶ (Athens, 1980); and T. Chatzidakis-Bacharas, *Les peintures murales de Hosios Loukas. Les chapelles occidentales* (Athens, 1982). General notice in J. Koder and F. Hild, *Tabula Imperii Byzantini, I. Hellas und Thessalien* (Vienna, 1976), 205–6.

<sup>19</sup> Professors Paul Mylonas and Nano Chatzidakis were kind enough to present our seminar with their important findings concerning the architectural history and the iconography program of Hosios Loukas. Mylonas' findings have since been published: Δομικὴ ἔρευνα στὸ ἐκκλησιαστικὸ συγκρότημα τοῦ Ὁσίου Λουκᾶ Φωκίδος, *Ἀρχαιολογία* 36 (September 1990), 6–30. Even more recent is C. Connor, *Art and Miracles in Medieval Byzantium: The Crypt at Hosios Loukas and Its Frescoes* (Princeton, 1991).

<sup>20</sup> One exception: C. Connor squeezes all construction, decoration, and marble revetments into the 10th century, in spite of the fact that there is a mosaic portrait of St. Nikon, who died in 997. But this hardly fits with a 10th-century date.

in the canticle that the translation of the relics occurred on the third of May, which coincided with the feast of the Ascension: in the eleventh century, this coincidence occurred only three times, in 1011, 1022, and 1095. Chatzidakis chose the year 1011, because the author of the canticle speaks of “invasions of the Scythians,” a phrase that must have been written before the abolition of the state of the Bulgar sovereign Samuel (cf. note 49 below).

For his part, Mylonas in his recent publication (cf. note 19 above) has studied in detail the architectural remains of the churches of Hosios Loukas and proposed four major stages in their construction. (a) The church of St. Barbara, which had been founded before St. Luke’s death, (b) was considerably enlarged later; he supposes that this occurred toward the end of the tenth century and assumes that it was then rededicated to the Virgin, becoming thus the actual church of the Panagia. (c) Above the tomb of St. Luke a cruciform two-storey martyrium was initially built, (d) and was later replaced by (and incorporated into) the actual katholikon. Mylonas also assumes that the new church of the Virgin is the one depicted in the hands of Philotheos. Consequently he dates the inauguration of the new church of the Panagia in 1011 and that of the katholikon under Constantine Monomachos, as this is attested by the fifteenth-century traveler Cyriacus of Ancona.

As far as this study is concerned, the two theories diverge mainly as to which church is the one depicted in the hands of Philotheos. I think that one can safely accept that abbot Philotheos performed the translation of the saint’s relics on a third of May, most probably in 1011. On that day a new church was inaugurated in the monastery, the katholikon (Chatzidakis) or the new church of St. Barbara/the Virgin (Mylonas). Of the two hypotheses, the first appears closer to reality: in the saint’s canticle studied by Chatzidakis (cf. notes 16 and 17 above), it is clearly stated that his new, monumental tomb was placed from the very beginning inside a church dedicated to the saint himself (*ναῷ . . . ἐν καινῷ, δὲν ἔγειρεν εἰς σὸν ὄνομα . . .*), that is, inside the katholikon which is effectively dedicated to St. Luke.

Let us now return to the frescoes<sup>21</sup> in the crypt’s southeastern groin vault, which have to be examined in conjunction with the frescoes of the north-

<sup>21</sup> My remarks are largely based on what has already been written by Chatzidakis (who also provides the relevant iconographic material) and by Connor, *Hosios Loukas*, 48 ff.

eastern groin vault. Both vaults are divided into four; in each quarter there is one portrait. In the northeastern vault we find four saints (all are called ὁ ἄγιος in the accompanying inscriptions): St. Luke (the founder of the monastery), St. Athanasios of Alexandria, St. Theodosios the *koinobiarches* (4th century), and St. Philotheos the Confessor (10th century). In the southeastern vault are the four abbots of Hosios Loukas mentioned above; they have the same names and are in the same order as the saints of the northeastern vault. Each portrait is accompanied by an inscription calling the person depicted ὁσιος πατήρ (holy father) and not ἄγιος (saint): ὁ ὁσιος πατήρ ἡμῶν Λουκᾶς, ὁ ὁσιος πατήρ ἡμῶν Ἀθανάσιος, ὁ ὁσιος πατήρ ἡμῶν Θεοδόσιος, ὁ ὁσιος πατήρ ἡμῶν Φιλόθεος. The expression ὁ ὁσιος πατήρ shows that the persons depicted were abbots of the monastery.

The “holy father” Luke has been identified by Chatzidakis with the founder of the monastery. Yet this identification presents a problem: the founder is always represented with a black (or brown) beard, while this abbot’s beard is white. Moreover, St. Luke the founder is always called “the saint” (ὁ ἄγιος), while the monk represented here is called ὁ ὁσιος πατήρ ἡμῶν, like the other abbots. Connor (pp. 51–52) rejected Chatzidakis’ point of view and proposed the identification of this portrait with St. Luke the Styliste (d. 979). But this in turn seems quite unlikely: St. Luke the Styliste would obviously be out of context in this position, in the midst of the abbots of Hosios Loukas.

I believe that the person depicted here is an early abbot of Hosios Loukas, who was also named Luke but who was not the founder. He is not an unknown person: in a village that used to be a dependency of St. Luke in Euboea, near Aliveri, there is an inscription commemorating the construction of a church in 1014, “nine years” (θ' ἔτη) after the death of “our holy father Luke” (τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Λουκᾶ).<sup>22</sup> This is an abbot Luke who died in 1005, as opposed to the founder, who had been deceased since 953. Here again he is called ὁ ὁσιος πατήρ ἡμῶν, as he is in the groin vault. The way in which he is mentioned allows

<sup>22</sup> A. Orlando, Τὸ παρὰ τὸ Ἀλιβέρι μετόχιον τοῦ Ὁσίου Λουκᾶ Φωκιδός, Ἀρχ.Βυζ.Μνημ.Ἐλλ. 7 (1951), 141–43; cf. Chatzidakis, “A propos de la date,” 129 note 16. There is an improved edition of this inscription by N. Belenis: “Επιλεγόμενα σε επιγραφές του μετοχίου του Οσίου Λουκά Εύβοιας,” in Αρμός. Τιμητικός τόμος στον καθηγητή N. K. Μουτσόπουλο (Thessaloniki, 1990), 353–61.

one to think that he was remembered, at least in Euboea of 1014, as an important abbot.

Philotheos is undoubtedly the founder of the church that he is depicted as offering to St. Luke and which is most probably the katholikon. The black-haired Athanasios, also an abbot, is not known to me from other sources.<sup>23</sup> The white-haired ὁσιος Theodosios must have been, I believe, the same person as the "holy" abbot of Steirion, Theodosios Leobachos, who lived around 1048 and whom we identified with Theodore/Theodosios of the funerary inscription.

As mentioned above, three of the abbots of the southeastern groin vault are also depicted on a fresco at the entrance of the crypt. In the center of the entrance barrel vault, we have Christ blessing. On one side, we have a monk who is also blessing and holds a scroll: he has been identified with the founder of the monastery. On the other side, there is a group of monks, and, in the front row, three abbots turned toward Christ. The first can easily be identified with Theodosios of the groin vault: he has both hands raised in supplication. The second, Athanasios of the groin vault, has only his right hand raised. The third, Philotheos, does not raise his hands. If the order in which they are represented is chronological, Athanasios should be placed sometime between 1011 (abbot Philotheos) and 1048 (abbot Theodosios). But this is hypothetical.

It is obvious that these abbots, who are persistently represented in the frescoes, must also have been benefactors of the monastery. We have seen that Philotheos could lay such a claim as the founder of the katholikon. We may assume that the others contributed toward other monuments. Theodosios could well be related to the luxurious mosaic decoration of the katholikon, a decoration that must have impressed everyone then, as it does now.

One cannot say with certainty who did what and why. But the hypothesis relating Theodosios to the mosaic decoration<sup>24</sup> may be supported by the following. (1) This was a very expensive enterprise,

<sup>23</sup> Connor, *Hosios Loukas*, 52, identified this monk as St. Athanasios the Athonite, the founder of the Great Lavra, who would have been represented there as an *hosios* well before his death (1001 or later). This is most unlikely.

<sup>24</sup> Chatzidakis-Bachar, *Les peintures murales*, 184–88, has already expressed the idea that the abbot Leobachos may have financed the decoration of the katholikon and thus imposed the representations of his patron saint, Theodore. The hypothesis seems reasonable and is not weakened by the new reading of the name on the confraternity typikon (Theodosios and not Theodore) because, as we have seen, St. Theodore was his pa-

hardly imaginable without some support from the emperor. It is obvious that a former anthypatos, patriarch, vestes, and katepano was in a particularly good position to obtain such support. (2) According to a tradition that Cyriacus of Ancona read in a (now lost and unidentifiable) manuscript, the founder of the monastery of Hosios Loukas would have been Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–55). This could also concern the *decoration* of the katholikon, thanks to which Constantine IX may well have gained the name of *ktētor*.<sup>25</sup> If so, this must have occurred in the early years of his reign, when he, together with his co-empresses Zoe and Theodora, distributed funds generously, especially to religious foundations. This was the time when Theodosios Leobachos was the abbot of Hosios Loukas. By contrast, Constantine IX's last years were characterized by extreme stinginess.<sup>26</sup>

Quite apart from the works that Theodosios may have had executed in the monastery, it may be considered as certain that the crypt frescoes must have been made after his death, that is, certainly after 1048, but not much later, for art historians date them close to the mosaics. The execution of these former abbots' portraits could have been the work of the abbot Gregory, who had the marble revetment made, obviously soon after the mosaics were finished.<sup>27</sup> These former abbots were probably buried in the crypt, where three tombs still exist, and others may have existed in the past. This is where I would expect to find the arcosolium on which the inscription of Theodore/Theodosios may have initially been placed.<sup>28</sup>

The above remarks, if accepted, invite a new reading of the frescoes of the crypt's two groin vaults. On the southeast vault we have the pictures of the four *higoumenoi* of the first half of the eleventh century, who presumably carried out important works in the monastery and gave it the grandiose appearance that it retains: Luke (d. 1005), Philotheos (fl. 1011), Athanasios and Theodosios

tron saint from the time when he was a layman. Connor has also attributed the mosaic decoration to the abbot Leobachos.

<sup>25</sup> Stikas has defended the idea that the katholikon was founded by Constantine Monomachos, but I think that the question is seen from a more realistic perspective by Chatzidakis, *Ελληνικά* 25 (1972), 301–9.

<sup>26</sup> Michael Attaleiates, Bonn ed., 50–51.

<sup>27</sup> Chatzidakis, "A propos de la date," 141. It is notable that parts of the walls of the crypt are decorated with imitation marble ornament, as if the sponsor was trying to follow the example set by the katholikon above.

<sup>28</sup> It should be stressed though that the inscription, because of its dimensions, does not belong to any of the existing tombs.

(fl. 1048). On the northeast vault we have the saints whose names the four higoumenoi took when they became monks and who could be considered as their spiritual protectors and sources of inspiration.

The whole crypt thus acquires a new meaning. When the relics of the founder were brought to the main floor to make them more accessible to the faithful, the crypt kept its mortuary character with emphasis on the recent internal history of the monastery. It was dedicated to some great reforming higoumenoi of the recent past—the higoumenoi whose names were associated with the new and luxurious Hosios Loukas.

#### IV. THE MAIN PHASES OF THE MONASTERY OF HOSIOS LOUKAS

In what follows I will try to present a scenario with some of the phases that the monastery of Hosios Loukas may have gone through in the first century of its existence. The basic source will be the Life of St. Luke, and references to the latest edition of this text are provided in square brackets.<sup>29</sup>

During the second half of the ninth century, mainland Greece had begun recovering from the Slavic onslaught. New churches were founded by local patrons, as we know from the surviving inscriptions of St. John Mangoutis in Athens (871), St. Gregory in Thebes (871/2), and Skripou in Orchomenos (873/75).<sup>30</sup> Coins began circulating during the reign of Emperor Theophilos (829–842); the distribution of finds, though, is very unequal: many in Corinth, fewer in Athens, and very few in Thebes (which, it must be said in fairness, has never been properly excavated in this respect). In the following centuries, numismatic circulation would improve, but the distribution of the finds followed the same pattern.<sup>31</sup>

St. Luke's family were refugees from Aigina; they had abandoned their island out of fear of the

<sup>29</sup> D. Sofianos, "Οσιος Λουκας. 'Ο βίος του δοσίου Λουκᾶ του Στειρώτη" (Athens, 1989). A similar, more detailed study with diverging but interesting results has been undertaken by Connor.

<sup>30</sup> A. Xyngopoulos, Εύρετήριον τῶν μνημείων τῆς Ἑλλάδος A. Εύρετήριον τῶν Μεσαιωνικῶν μνημείων. I. Ἀθηνῶν, fasc. 2 (Athens, 1929), 85–87; G. A. Sotiriou, 'Ο ἐν Θήβαις βυζαντινὸς ναὸς Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου,' Αρχ. Εφ. (1924), 1–26; M. Sotiriou, 'Ο ναὸς τῆς Σκριπούς τῆς Βουωτίας,' Αρχ. Εφ. (1931), 119–57.

<sup>31</sup> My knowledge of the circulation of coinage in the region is based on a communication of Mrs. Vasso Pennas.

Arabs<sup>32</sup> and had moved to the northern shore of the Gulf of Corinth in the second half of the ninth century [160]. They settled at Kastorion, where they became wealthy shepherds. Then came friction with the local population, who wanted to drive them away as immigrants without any property (ἐπήλυδας καὶ παροίκους<sup>33</sup>), and Constantinople had to intervene: in accordance with an imperial order, the land was divided between the indigenous population and the newcomers [161]. Thanks to this intervention by the administration, the refugees settled permanently and became farmers [164].

In the early tenth century, Boeotia and Phokis seem once again to be threatened from the north. The passes to Thessaly are closely controlled by soldiers [165–66], while by contrast the movement of men toward the south and west is frequent and easy [166–67, 174, 180]. The region is crossed by travelers going to Rome and Athens [171, 174]. Even remote places, like Mount Ioannitzi, where Luke started his life as a hermit, were close to cenobitic monasteries [171] and permitted contacts with local shipowners [180].

In 918 the region became the object of raids by Tsar Symeon: not only looting and taking of prisoners, but also a deliberate effort at conquest by claiming from the populations the payment of taxes [ὑποφέροντος ποιούμενος, 182]. Many inhabitants fled, some to the islands of the Gulf of Corinth,<sup>34</sup> others to the fortified cities, to Euboea, or to the Peloponnese. St. Luke went to Corinth, then to the region of Patras; once he tried to return home, but was arrested and whipped. The authorities would certainly not allow any demographic reinforcement of a region under the control of the Bulgars, who then demanded that Byzantium recognize them as masters of all the Balkan peninsula.<sup>35</sup>

The Bulgarian invasion is also mentioned in the

<sup>32</sup> The Arab attacks on Aigina that forced the population to abandon the island are described in the Life of St. Luke, the Life of St. Athanasia (ed. Lydia Carras, in *Maistor* [Canberra, 1984], 212), and the Life of St. Theodora of Thessaloniki (ed. Arsenij, [Jurjev, 1899], 2–4).

<sup>33</sup> In this context, the word παροίκος is used with its primary meaning of a person who, lacking property, lives on someone else's land.

<sup>34</sup> Medieval remains have been found on some islands in the Gulf of Corinth and have been interpreted as remnants of populations who tried to flee the Slavs in the 6th–7th century: S. Hood, "Isles of Refuge in the Early Byzantine Period," *BSA* 65 (1970), 37–45. But this date and interpretation have been contested by Timothy Gregory.

<sup>35</sup> Nicholas I, *Letters*, no. 27, line 73.

Chronicle of Galaxidi<sup>36</sup> as well as in two scholia of Arethas of Caesarea, which inform us that even the city of Thebes was threatened (without saying whether it ever actually fell to the Bulgars).<sup>37</sup> The impression remains that the Bulgarian army invaded every year and collected taxes without systematically trying to besiege the cities.<sup>38</sup> Be that as it may, St. Luke stayed in the Peloponnese for approximately ten years. Things improved only after the death of Symeon and the conclusion of a treaty with his successor, Peter. In 928 the refugees returned to what was left of their homes.

Fifteen years later there was a new invasion, this time by the Hungarians. Once again the peasants, Luke with them, were forced to abandon their homes and take refuge on an island in the Gulf of Corinth, called (then and now) Ampelon [195–96]. According to the Life of St. Luke, the Hungarian invasion lasted three years. In fact we know from the chronicles that the Hungarians attacked Macedonia and Thrace in 943, and were rapidly pushed back.<sup>39</sup> But their attacks on Greece (in which the Constantinopolitan chroniclers show no interest) continued. The strategos of Thessaloniki, Katakalon, who held this position by May 942,<sup>40</sup> was killed while fighting them in 945, as we learn from an anonymous epigram.<sup>41</sup> The information from the Life is thus confirmed by independent sources, including, I believe, the Chronicle of Galaxidi, which gives a lively—and not necessarily exaggerated—image of how frightful the Hun-

garian invasions of the tenth century may have been.<sup>42</sup>

After the invasions came the rebuilding. But the general level of life undoubtedly declined. The monastery of Hosios Loukas is the only known church in mainland Greece that seems to have been founded in the tenth century. Hellas is seen by the Constantinopolitans as an underdeveloped part of the empire, as is suggested by the following epigram: “To someone who went to Hellas and became rustic: Having seen Greece, not the land of the barbarians, you have become barbarized in your speech as well as your manners.”<sup>43</sup>

The main city in the neighborhood of Hosios Loukas, Thebes, had a structured society [190, 203], and received imperial officials [204]. The city was walled, but in times of peace could easily be entered, even during the night [191, 192]. There was at least one monastery outside the walls [190, 192, 202] as well as at least one public bath [192]. It was the seat of the strategos of Hellas [200]; but this official left his family behind in Constantinople, suggesting that the quality of life in Thebes was not entirely acceptable. Its inhabitants were mostly farmers.<sup>44</sup> In spite of this, the strategos could afford to finance the building of the new church of St. Barbara (which eventually became the present-day church of the Virgin at Hosios Loukas): he provided workers as well as cash [μετὰ τῆς χειρὸς καὶ τὴν δαπάνην, 202].

The second city of the region was Athens, known for the great church of the Virgin in the Parthenon; it also had at least one monastery, in which the young Luke assumed monastic garb. The city served as a stopover for those traveling from Rome to Jerusalem: they sailed to the north shore of the Gulf of Corinth, then crossed Phokis and Boeotia to reach the port of Athens [166–67]. We know that in the early tenth century Athens underwent a period of social upheaval.<sup>45</sup>

Corinth, the capital of the theme of Peloponnese, is mentioned more often than Athens and seems to be the largest and most important

<sup>36</sup> C. Sathas, Χρονικὸν ἀνέκδοτον Γαλαξειδίου (Athens, 1865; repr. 1914), 200–202; more recent editions by G. Valettas (Athens, 1944), and E. Anagnostakis (Athens, 1985). It has been suggested that this chronicle refers to Samuel's invasion of Greece (Sathas, Anagnostakis, and especially P. Tivčev, “Nouvelles données sur les guerres des Bulgares contre Byzance au temps de tsar Samuel,” *Byzantinobulgarica* 3 [1969], 37–45). See also D. Krabartogiannos, ‘Απόψεις περὶ τῆς ἐπιδρομῆς τῶν Βουλγάρων στὴν Ἑλλάδα τὸν 100 αἰώνα καὶ τὸ δαλματικὸν τοπονύμιο Σάλονα, *Βυζαντινὸς Δόμος* 1 (1987), 213–20. But the point of view of Bees (see note 37 below), which is supported by the Life of St. Luke, is far more convincing.

<sup>37</sup> N. Bees, Αἱ ἐπιδρομαὶ τῶν Βουλγάρων ὑπὸ τὸν τζάρον Συμεὼν καὶ τὰ σχετικὰ σχόλια τοῦ Ἀρεθᾶ Καισαρείας, *Ἐλληνικά* 1 (1928), 337–70. The question was reexamined by J. Rosser, “A Tenth Century Bulgar Attack on ‘The Great Isthmus Corridor’ of Central Greece,” *17th International Byzantine Congress, Abstracts of Short Papers* (Washington, D.C., 1986), 299.

<sup>38</sup> See the recent study by T. Bazaïou-Barabas, Σημεώνα μιὰ γιὰ τὴν ἐπιδρομὴ τοῦ τοάρου Συμεὼν κατὰ τῆς κυρίως Ἑλλάδας (ἀρχές 10ου αἰώνα), *Σύμμεικτα* 8 (1989), 383–97.

<sup>39</sup> Theophanes Continuatus, Bonn ed., 430.

<sup>40</sup> *Actes du Probaton*, ed. D. Papachryssanthou (Paris, 1975), no. 4, line 13; cf. no. 6.

<sup>41</sup> Νέος Ἑλλ. 16 (1922), 53–54 (the epigram was written after the deposition of the Lakapenoi: 27 January 945).

<sup>42</sup> Sathas, *Χρονικόν*, 203. In this chronicle, the Hungarians are not mentioned by name; the invaders are called πειράταις, literally “pirates,” but the author uses the word for any invader, including the Bulgars. It has also been proposed that these barbarian invaders be identified with the Ouzes of 1064 (Anagnostakis, 78–79).

<sup>43</sup> PG 106, col. 922: Εἴς τινα κατελθόντα εἰς Ἑλλάδα καὶ δύρουισθέντα: Οὐ βαρβάρων γῆν, ἀλλ᾽ ἴδων τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἐβαρβαρώθης καὶ λόγον καὶ τὸν τρόπον.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Koder and Hild, *Hellas*, 269–71.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. ibid., 126–29.

city in the region. Not only did it have at least one primary school [182], but it also hosted a certain Theophylaktos, a famous teacher of classical literature [194]—a high-level professor, like those who were then attested almost exclusively in Constantinople.<sup>46</sup> It was an important port [188–90]. The economic domination of Corinth over the whole region is also attested by the numismatic finds mentioned above.

The places where St. Luke chose to stay, on the coast or near the coast of Boeotia and Phokis, appear to be true crossroads: many ships as well as many travelers are mentioned [197]. Some ships are local, others come directly from Italy [196]. It is obvious that the Via Egnatia from Durazzo to Thessaloniki was then closed and that ships avoided sailing around the Peloponnese for fear of the Arabs of Crete. Travelers from Corinth to the north of Greece often crossed Boeotia [182, 185–87, 193]. The monks had frequent contacts with Thebes [200, 201]; from there one could go to Thessaloniki via (Bralos and) Larissa [201, 203]. When St. Luke moved more to the west, close to the village of Steiri [197], he realized that there again he was surrounded by several villages [*τὰς κώνιλφ κώμας*, 206; *ἐν γειτόνων χωρῖται*, 208]; moreover, he was close to the plain of Amphissa, which received many travelers going to Italy [208] or coming from Italy via Naupaktos.<sup>47</sup>

The monastery of Hosios Loukas was thus founded in a region recovering after a period of destruction, and which was then an important passageway between the Peloponnese and mainland Greece, between east and west.<sup>48</sup> One may assume that, like so many other monasteries, Hosios Loukas must have served not only as a center for miraculous healings but also as a hostel for travelers—and this from its very beginning: according to the Life of St. Luke, a hostel was one of the first

<sup>46</sup>Such teachers were rare outside the capital in the 10th century: see P. Lemerle, “Elèves et professeurs à Constantinople au Xe siècle,” *CRAI* 1969, 576–87; idem, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris, 1971), 242–66. Cf. also A. Markopoulos, ‘Η ὁργάνωση τοῦ σχολείου, Η καθημερινή ζωὴ στὸ Βυζάντιο

(Athens, 1989), 325–33.

<sup>47</sup>G. Rossi-Taibi, *Vita di San Elia il Giovane* (Palermo, 1962),

108, 110, 116.

<sup>48</sup>The routes and ports of the region are described by Koder and Hild, *Hellas*, 97–98 and 101–4 on the basis of later sources, without taking into consideration the Life of St. Luke. It is interesting to note that the image given above on the basis of the Life differs considerably from that in Koder and Hild, obviously because the general situation of the region changed radically after the Arabs were driven from Crete and Bulgaria was conquered by Basil II: the Via Egnatia as well as the maritime route around the Peloponnese were then reopened.

buildings in this monastic complex [209: τῶν ἐπιξενούμενῶν ὑποδοχῆν].

While the saint was still alive, the church of St. Barbara had been built thanks to the help of a strategos of Hellas named Krenites [202]. The saint himself was very much inspired by modesty: he had asked to be buried in the simplest possible way at the very spot on which he would die; and in fact he was buried in the ground of his cell. But soon things started changing, as people thought of exploiting a relic reputed for its miracles. A monk from Paphlagonia named Kosmas volunteered his “know-how”: the tomb of the saint was elevated above the level of the soil and decorated with slabs (i.e., it became a sarcophagus, like those that still exist in the crypt at Hosios Loukas), and was protected with a railing, in such a way that it could be touched only by those who had shown the necessary piety (and obtained the necessary permission) [208]. The saint’s hermitage was thus becoming a *proskynēma*. The church of St. Barbara was finished and decorated, the monastic cells and a hostel were built, as well as a second church (*εὐκτήριον*) in the form of a cross, situated above the saint’s tomb [209]: this was a kind of martyrium. And the miracles, mainly healings, began to proliferate for the benefit of the inhabitants of a large region: Attica, Boeotia, Phthiotis, Phokis, Euboea, the islands. A few years after the saint’s death, his monastery had become a major center of piety in the region. Yet it appears to have been an institution of moderate size and ambitions.

At this point the Life of St. Luke ends, and we have no further information concerning the rest of the tenth century. But in the eleventh, probably starting with the higoumenate of Luke II (d. 1005), important construction work was undertaken in the monastery: additions to the church of the Virgin (i.e., St. Barbara), construction of the new katholikon in the place of the church/martyrium, installation of a new sarcophagus for the saint in a place easily accessible to pilgrims, the translation of the relics, the outstanding decoration of the new katholikon, which made Hosios Loukas an extraordinary monastic complex, comparable to any monument of the Byzantine capital. The translation of the relics constituted a new inauguration of the monastery; thus its anniversary (3 May) became the main feast day (*πανήγυρις*) of the year, more important than the anniversary of St. Luke’s death, which, most inconveniently, fell in the middle of winter (7 February).

This series of reconstructions could have been

provoked by a man-made catastrophe, such as the Bulgarian invasion of 996/7, or by a natural phenomenon, such as a landslide.<sup>49</sup> But it may also simply reflect a new mentality prevailing during this time. The eleventh century was a period of peace and security for the empire, which was on the verge of adopting new, more open social and economic structures. It was a period of peace and security for mainland Greece as well, as is clearly seen in the Life of St. Meletios of Myoupolis.<sup>50</sup> Important building activity was conducted in various locations. The monastery of Hosios Loukas, particularly active and obviously with considerable funds at its disposal, was a major healing center tending toward expansion: for example, in 1014, a church of the healing saints Kosmas and Damian was built at the metochion of the monastery near Aliveri in Euboea. At approximately the same time, another

<sup>49</sup>The threat of the barbarians is mentioned in the offices written for the translation of the relics in or shortly after 1011: τὰ θράση θραῦσον τῶν πολεμούντων ἡμᾶς, τὰς σκυθικὰς χαλίνωσον ἐπιδρομὰς ταῖς προστασίαις σου and τοὺς βαρεῖς λύκους, δάβδω τῆς πρεσβείας σου, ἀποδιώκων αὐτῆς τοὺς πολεμούντας ἡμᾶς (Kremos, Φωκικά, I, 117, 129). On the other hand, the hypothesis of a landslide is based on the configuration of the monastery's land, which is now secured with impressive retaining walls.

<sup>50</sup>V. G. Vasil'evskij, in *Pravoslavnij Palestinskij Sbornik* 6.2 (1886), 1–69.

metochion of the monastery seems to have been founded in the village of Politiki in Euboea.<sup>51</sup> The healing saints also occupy a distinguished position in the mosaic decoration. It is clear that the abbots of Hosios Loukas were able to think big and single-mindedly.

At the same time a new local cult was being promoted with the tombs and frescoes of the crypt honoring the abbots Luke, Philotheos, Athanasios, and Theodosios, the new founders of the monastery.<sup>52</sup> Because of their efforts and thanks to the help of pilgrims, the local aristocracy, and Constantinople, the initially modest hermitage of the saint had become a grand, wealthy, and influential center of pilgrimage, the pride of southern mainland Greece, a source of inspiration, and proof that the difficulties of the past had disappeared for good and that a new, more sophisticated, era was dawning.

University of Athens

<sup>51</sup>This hypothesis was presented by Ch. Bouras, Περὶ τὴν χρονολόγηση τῆς Περιβλέπτου στὰ Πολιτικὰ Εύβοιας, 10ο Συμπόσιο Βυζαντινῆς καὶ Μεταβυζαντινῆς Ἀρχαιολογίας καὶ Τέχνης (Athens, 1990), 52–53.

<sup>52</sup>This is not the only case in which new founders received respect equal to that of the initial founder of a monastery; see *Actes de Docheiariou*, 7–11.